Appendix B CEQA Checklist

Determining Significance Under CEQA

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 (b) broadly defines a significant effect on the environment as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the physical environment. For the purpose of this document, pertinent criteria from the CEQA Guidelines were used to establish significance criteria for the project. A significant impact would occur under the following circumstances:

- Implementation of the project would induce substantial population growth in the area;
- Implementation of the project would change the community cohesion or the economy of the area;
- Implementation of the project would effect the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities in a manner that would physically deteriorate the facility or reduce its ability to function as a recreational resource;
- Implementation of the alternatives would create the need for new or substantially altered public facilities, utilities or services;
- Implementation of the alternatives would create a disproportionate impact to an Environmental Justice Community.

CEQA Environmental Checklist

The following checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. The CEQA impact levels include potentially significant impact, less-than-significant impact with mitigation, less-than-significant impact, and no impact. Please refer to the following for detailed discussions regarding impacts:

- Guidance: Title 14, Chapter 3, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq. (http://www.ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/)

- Statutes: Division 13, California Public Resource Code, Sections 21000-21178.1 (http://www.ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/stat/)

CEQA requires that environmental documents determine significant or potentially significant impacts. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the project indicate no impacts. A "no impact" reflects this determination. Any needed discussion is included in the section following the checklist.

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
AESTHETICS - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		X		
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		X		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X		
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X		

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.	☐	☐	X	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	X
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	X	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would be the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?		X		
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would be the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
NOISE - Would the project:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X		
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X
POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	X	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	X	☐
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	X	☐
PUBLIC SERVICES -				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	X
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X
RECREATION -				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	X

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would be the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which his substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patters, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incomplete uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would be the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion of CEQA Checklist Responses and Summary of Mitigation Measures

Impacts discussed below are referenced to the appropriate resource area and subsection identified in the checklist (i.e., Noise "a)," etc.). The mitigation measures identified are incomplete in the sense that they have not yet been agreed upon by all of the appropriate responsible agencies.

Impacts Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level

The following summarizes the mitigation for impacts determined less than significant with mitigation, and references the sections of this IS/EA where the mitigation is described.

Aesthetics

c) There is a potential for impacts to occur to the visual character or quality of the project area (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.17.3, and Mitigation, Section 2.17.5).

Mitigation. *The following measures would reduce this impact to less than significant:*

- *Design and place landscaping along areas disturbed by construction to screen the roadway and associated vehicles.*
- *Use slope rounding techniques to integrate the structures into the landscape.*
- *Construct retaining walls to avoid or minimize impacts on adjacent properties. Match color and textures to existing walls within the project limits.*
- *Make new soundwalls similar in design and finish to existing walls in the vicinity. Install planting where adequate space is available and maintenance is feasible. Plant vines at even intervals along the soundwalls to reduce the walls' visual dominance and glare and to deter graffiti.*

Biological Resources

a,d) There is a potential to impact protected or candidate species or their habitat, sensitive natural communities, or movement of native residents or migratory wildlife (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.8.2, and Mitigation, Section 2.8.4).

Mitigation. *Twelve measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts to listed steelhead to reduce the potential impact to less than significant. These measures range from limiting construction activities to certain seasons in areas where habitat is identified to ensuring that materials placed in streams shall be nontoxic. These measures are detailed in Section 2.8.4.*

All proposed measures to mitigate impacts to biological resources would be subject to approval by the appropriate Federal and State natural resource agencies.

Geology and Soils

a i, ii,iii, c) There is a potential for impacts from fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, and locating the project on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.9.2, and Mitigation, Section 2.9.5).

Mitigation. *Incorporating recommendations from geologic and geotechnical investigations performed during the final design would reduce these impacts to less than significant. A regular maintenance program, including annual inspections, should also be carried out. Section 2.9.5 details the mitigation recommendations.*

Hydrology and Water Quality (Floodplains)

h) There is a potential for impacts because of the placement of the proposed project within a 100-year flood hazard area, which could result in impeding or redirecting flood flows (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.10.2, and Mitigation, Section 2.10.5).

Mitigation. *Designing the proposed new bridge structure to maintain current flow capacity would reduce this impact to less than significant.*

Noise

a, d) There is a potential for generation of noise levels in excess of established standards from existing and future traffic volumes, and during project construction (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.4.2, and Mitigation, Section 2.4.5).

Mitigation. *The construction of soundwalls would be incorporated into the project design.*

Population and Housing

c) Some residents living within the proposed right-of-way would be adversely affected by the proposed project. Impacts to people within the project right-of-way would include the relocation of people in five to seven homes. A business may also be relocated if a slip ramp is built at Pacheco Boulevard. This relocation impact is considered significant (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.14.3, and Mitigation, Section 2.14.8).

Mitigation. *The individuals and businesses displaced by the project would be offered relocation assistance services and payments for purposes of locating a suitable replacement property, in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended. Eligible displaced households are also entitled to relocation payments to relieve the financial hardship of locating and acquiring replacement housing. Mitigation measures would be adopted by CCTA and Caltrans to reduce the relocation impacts to less than significant.*

Mitigation for Impacts That Are Less Than Significant

The following less than significant impacts include recommended mitigation that would ensure the avoidance of significant impacts.

Aesthetics

a) There is a potential for adverse effects to occur to a scenic vista (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.17.3, and Mitigation, Section 2.17.5).

Mitigation. *Impacts would be minimized and avoided by the following measure:*

- *Design and place landscaping along areas disturbed by construction to screen the roadway and associated vehicles.*

d) There is a potential for impacts to occur from new sources of light or glare (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.17.3, and Mitigation, Section 2.17.5).

Mitigation. *Impacts would be minimized and avoided by the following measure:*

- *Limit and design lighting to minimize light intrusion into adjacent areas. Include landscaping, where space allows, to help screen lighting from vehicles to residential areas adjacent to the freeways.*

Air Quality

a,b,c,d) There would be potential construction impacts to air quality (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.3.2, and Mitigation, Section 2.3.5).

Mitigation. *Temporary impacts would be avoided and minimized by the instituting dust control measures identified in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (BAAQMD 1999). These measures are specified in Section 2.3.5.*

Biological Resources

b) There is a potential to impact a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.7.3, and Mitigation, Section 2.7.5).

Mitigation. *Impacts would be minimized and avoided by the following measures:*

- *Loss of nesting habitat trees of any special-status species discovered during preconstruction surveys shall be mitigated by preserving those trees or ones similar on the site that can produce substitute nesting habitat, or by installing replacement trees as part of the project landscaping.*
- *In October of each construction year and at project completion, slopes and graded areas would be reseeded for erosion control.*

c) There is a potential to impact federally protected wetlands (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.6.2, and Mitigation, Section 2.6.5).

Mitigation. *Temporary and construction impacts would be avoided and minimized by the following measures:*

- *Limit disturbance to actual project site and necessary access routes, avoiding existing grades and vegetation.*
- *Erosion control and sediment detention devices shall be incorporated into the project design and implemented during construction.*
- *Disturbed soils shall undergo erosion control treatment prior to October 31 and after construction is completed.*

- *Restrict work within creek channels to a "work window" (e.g., June 1 to mid-October).*

Permanent impacts to wetlands would be avoided or minimized by the following measures:

- *Permanent revegetation and tree replanting will be performed.*
- *On-site wetland mitigation opportunities appear limited. Off-site, compensatory mitigation may be available through a conservation bank or an in-lieu fee.*

Geology and Soils

a iv, b, d) Hazards due to landslides, substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, or expansive soils would result in a less than significant impact (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.9.2, and Mitigation, Section 2.9.5).

Mitigation. *Incorporating recommendations from geologic and geotechnical investigations performed during the final design would further reduce this hazard. Section 2.9.5 details the mitigation recommendations.*

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

d) The project's proximity to a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 would result in a less than significant impact (see Impacts, beginning Section 2.2.2, and Mitigation, Section 2.2.4).

Mitigation. *To further reduce this impact, buildings acquired for the project would be investigated for contamination, and soil and groundwater testing may be conducted for four sites and for soils identified for grading or excavation. Section 2.2.4 details the mitigation recommendations.*